

Application No. 10/688,122

Amdt date May 20, 2004

Reply to Office action of April 22, 2004

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Claims 2-23 are now in the application. No claims have been added, cancelled or amended. Reconsideration and reexamination of the above identified patent application is hereby requested.

The Applicants have discovered a typographical error in the specification which has been corrected in the manner shown above.

The Examiner has provisionally rejected Claims 2 and 13 under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over Claims 1 and 19 of U.S. Patent No. 6,407,692. The Examiner states that Claims 2 and 13 would be allowable if a timely Terminal Disclaimer is filed.


The Applicants submit herewith a Terminal Disclaimer to overcome the obviousness-type double patenting rejection. Accordingly, the Applicant respectfully requests that the provisional double-patenting rejection of Claims 2 and 13 be withdrawn.

Claims 3-12 and 14 are dependent on Claim 2. Claims 15-23 are dependent on Claim 13. As such, Claims 3-12 and 14 are believed allowable based upon Claim 2, and Claims 15-23 are believed allowable based upon Claim 13.

Accordingly, in view of the above amendment and remarks it is submitted that the claims are patentable over the prior art of record and that all the rejections to the claims have been overcome. Reconsideration and reexamination of the above Application is requested.

Respectfully submitted,
CHRISTIE, PARKER & HALE, LLP

By



Art Hasan

Reg. No. 41,052

626/795-9900